

Illinois U Library TOWN MEETING



June 26, 1955
Vol. 21, No. 9
876th Broadcast

"THE UNITED NATIONS: 1945-1955"

Speakers:

BENJAMIN H. BROWN

WILLIAM J. FULTON, JR.

A discussion based upon the commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter with excerpts from addresses delivered at San Francisco by:

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

HAROLD MacMILLAN

V. M. MOLOTOV

V. K. KRISHNA MENON

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

HARRY S. TRUMAN

Moderator: SHEPHERD L. WITMAN



Broadcast from
ABC Radio—New York

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"THE UNITED NATIONS: 1945-1955"

Moderator: Shepherd L. Witman, Director of Residential Seminars on World Affairs

MR. WITMAN: As one who has listened to AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING for many years, and followed with keen interest its distinguished record in the discussion of current issues, I am delighted to serve as moderator on this occasion.

Tonight -- on the tenth anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter -- we depart somewhat from the customary format of TOWN MEETING. We have selected some of the more significant statements delivered during the past week at the commemorative ceremonies in San Francisco. You will hear tonight recorded excerpts from addresses by President Eisenhower, British Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, India's Krishna Menon and former President Harry S. Truman. For discussion of each quotation, we shall call on our studio guests -- Dr. Benjamin H. Brown, a former high-ranking member of the United States Mission to the United Nations, and William J. Fulton, Jr., United Nations correspondent of the "Chicago Tribune."

Last Monday evening, as the curtain went up on the San Francisco commemoration, President Dwight D. Eisenhower set the stage for the week's observance -- reiterating United States support of the United Nations and peering into the hopes for the future.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: With the birthday congratulations I bring, I re-affirm to you the support of the Government of the United States in the purposes and aims of the United Nations -- and in the hopes that inspired its founders. Today -- together -- we face a second decade. We face it with the accumulated experience of the first ten years, as well as with the awful knowledge of nuclear weapons and the realization that a certain and enduring peace still eludes our persistent search.

But the summer of 1955, like that of 1945, is another season of high hopes for the world. There again stirs in the hearts of men a renewed devotion to the work for the elimination of war. Each of us here is witness that never in ten years has the will of many nations seemed so resolved to wage an honest and sustained campaign for a just and lasting peace.

The object of our second decade is still peace -- but a peace of such new kind that all the world will think anew and act anew.

It cannot be a mere stilling of the guns -- it must be a glorious way of life. In that life the atom, dedicated once as man's slayer, will become his most productive servant. It will be a peace to inspire confidence and faith so that all people will be released from the fear of war. Scientists will be liberated to work always for men, never against them.

Who can doubt that in the next ten years world science can so beat down the ravages of disease and the pangs of poverty that human kind will experience a new expansion of living standards and of cultural and spiritual horizons. In this new kind of peace the artist, teacher and philosopher, workman, farmer, producer and scientist will truly work together for the common welfare.

These hopes are not new. They are as old as history. But now as we meet on this tenth anniversary in the city where was born the United Nations, we must realize that at last they are steadily and surely attainable. This is new. Our part is to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of the United Nations Charter. May we here and now renew our determination to fulfill man's ancient dream, the dream which so inspired the founders of this organization. Thus our duty will be nobly done, and future generations will behold the United Nations and stand up to call it blessed.

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

MR. WITMAN: Thus began this historic assessment of the first ten years of the United Nations. President Eisenhower's plea for renewed devotion to the cause of peace was to be echoed time and again throughout the week. But, before we go on to excerpts from the speakers to follow, let's open our studio discussion. Let us hear from you, Dr. Benjamin Brown, and from you, Mr. William Fulton, Jr., and let's look into some of the successes, as well as some of the shortcomings of the United Nations. First, let's hear from Dr. Benjamin H. Brown.

Former Deputy Secretary-General of the United States Mission to the United Nations, Dr. Brown also served as technical director to the American Assembly Meeting on the United Nations Charter Review. He is now a consultant, speaker and writer on international affairs and is author of the book, "The United States Stake in the United Nations." Dr. Brown, what do you have to say at this point?

DR. BROWN: It occurred to me, Mr. Witman, that we might begin by considering the question whether this conference in San Francisco last week has been worthwhile. I personally think that it has been worthwhile, and for a good many reasons of which I can only name one or two here in this preliminary statement.

In the first place, I think the meeting was a healthy opportunity to bring together the leading statesmen of the world for an exchange of views on problems that they confront. They were brought together without the necessity for making decisions as they would have to make to the normal U.N. meeting -- they were brought together with plenty of time for private consultation, private negotiation, which is so important if we are going to find our way out of the woods. One of the dominant themes to me, that kept finding expression in the speeches of governmental representatives, was the very deep desire that men have to find their way out of the woods. It seems to me an important and healthy thing that the statesmen should be reminded of this and, as one of the speakers pointed out, that in the final analysis men are more important than government.

One more thing -- it seems to me terribly important that this meeting gave us, as Americans, a chance to reflect on the importance of the U.N. to us and to the role that we can play in it, because I feel strongly and I would insist tonight that whether or not the Russians cooperate with us -- as we hope one day they will -- American support is really the important thing and that we can make or break this organization.

MR. WITMAN: Thank you, Dr. Brown. I am sure Mr. William J. Fulton, Jr. has something to say as an opening observation in tonight's discussion.

A native of Illinois, William J. Fulton, Jr. is official United Nations correspondent for the Chicago Tribune. He has covered the United Nations since the original preparatory meetings in London, in 1945. In the late forties, he was Chief of the Tribune's London Bureau. He has observed the foreign ministers' conferences in London, Moscow and New York. What do you have to say tonight to open up this discussion, Mr. Fulton?

MR. FULTON: Well, Mr. Witman and Dr. Brown, I listened with a great deal of interest and read with a great deal of interest, all the bursts of international oratory emanating from San Francisco during the last week and I think I could sum it up this way: that the United Nations headquarters here in New York City on the East River, where it has been the loudest debating society in the history of the world, was moved 3,000 miles west to the Pacific to become the loudest mutual admiration society in the world.

I disagree with you, Dr. Brown. I don't think it was worthwhile. I first saw the United Nations in operation in London, the preparatory commission in 1945 and then the General Assembly the following year. I formed an opinion there of the organization which I have never had changed by any subsequent event -- and that is that

the prime purpose, the real purpose behind this organization is to provide a forum of propaganda for the Communists. They get more out of it than we do. Every day that there is a session of any United Nations organization, whether it's the General Assembly, the Security Council or any of the specialized agencies, we hear this steady drip, drip of propaganda -- that the Russians and their satellites and Red China are the only peace loving nations in the world and that we, the effete capitalistic democracies are blocking peace.

I also noted in listening to these orations from the local statesmen in San Francisco, that they want to get the pioneering spirit back in the United Nations.

Well, why don't they call up that original pioneer, Alger Hiss, who was there at the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco. In fact, he was the principal midwife.

I think that the United Nations can be gauged this way, as far as the American viewpoint is concerned. We're spending about 45 billion dollars a year now on security. We have 300 bases -- Army, Navy and Air Force -- strung out all over the world. We have defense treaties with forty different countries, the primary aim of which is to defend ourselves against a senior partner in the United Nations -- to wit: the Soviet Union.

MR. WITMAN: There are two statements which certainly indicate the fact that whatever has happened in San Francisco last week, this is clearly tonight not a mutual agreement. I wonder if either one of you, or both, might want to comment on the observations of the other for a moment or two, before we go on?

DR. BROWN: Let me just say a word or two about the propaganda which the Russians have been waging in the United Nations, Mr. Witman. It hasn't had much effect if I can count -- I think I can count at least up to fifty -- which is where most of the votes in favor of the American resolutions find their level of affirmative expressions from the governments who are called upon to express their opinions. The Russians have a chance to sound off, but the world has a chance to judge. I think we have nothing whatever to fear. I think we can face them with these propaganda duels and we can always win because what we have to say is, in the end, more reasonable and commends itself more easily to the mind and the conscience of men everywhere.

MR. WITMAN: One of the things that struck me about your original statement, Dr. Brown, was your reference to the fact that this was important, not only because of its public aspect, but because of the private negotiations and private diplomacy which was possible to be carried out under the circumstances in San Francisco. What do you think about that, Mr. Fulton? Do you think this in any way strengthens the validity of having held the conferences there?

MR. FULTON: No, I don't think so one minute. I think that these preliminary conferences to the big Geneva Conference on the summit had to take place somewhere anyhow, and these gentlemen, these international statesmen, just happened to be in San Francisco at the time.

MR. WITMAN: You mean it might have been all right, but the 3,000 mile trip was wasted?

MR. FULTON: I don't think the trip was necessary.

DR. BROWN: Well, they all went tourist, I understand, and saved a lot of money that way.

MR. WITMAN: This is very interesting, but I wonder if we might go on now from this point and come back to some of these, because perhaps what some of the men had to say in San Francisco may throw some light on our subsequent discussion. Let's listen to some of the other significant statements which were made out on the West Coast last week.

For instance, British Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan was the first of the Big Four foreign ministers to speak to this distinguished gathering. He made reference to dividing forces within the United Nations membership and the lack of a military arm.

MR. MACMILLAN: The United Nations can justly claim to be a world organization; but we must recognize that it falls short of the ideal, which is that it should reflect fully the whole world community of peace-loving states. Though it may not be possible to solve that problem in present circumstances, yet, if the United Nations is to fulfill its true destiny, a solution must be found in due course. Prescient as they were, however, the founders of the United Nations could not foresee that the world would soon be ranged in two camps. In 1945 we assumed that there would be some continuing measure of harmony between the larger powers and that together they would ensure that aggression would never again be a possibility. The Security Council, with its military arm, was, if you remember, to have been the chosen instrument of this policy. Unhappily the military arm of the United Nations has never come into being, while the Security Council itself, as we know, has been unable to fulfill its true role. Few people, I think, could have predicted at San Francisco in 1945, that tensions would rapidly become so acute, and the world almost split into two. It would not be fitting on this occasion to try to apportion the blame. But the result is that the United Nations has not been able itself to provide collective security and will not be able to do so until the larger powers cooperate to that end.

MR. WITMAN: Now, on the positive side, British Secretary Macmillan spoke of the plan for peaceful application of the atom.

MR. MACMILLAN: And then there is one current activity which rather can be described as spectacular: namely, the imaginative proposal to create an international agency which will open the way to the use of atomic energy for the benefit and not for the destruction of mankind. This splendid idea is already taking shape. It is significant that it was in the United Nations itself that President Eisenhower first announced it; and it will be as a result of the unanimous vote taken in the General Assembly last November that the machinery will be established which may eventually prove to be the blueprint for a revolutionized industrial and social life in the world of the future. The nations which have learnt now how to harness nuclear power to serve pacific ends will soon be gathering at Geneva to exchange their knowledge and give all others the fruits of their researches. And this may well prove to be the most important international conference which the United Nations has organized.

MR. WITMAN: Gentlemen, there you have heard at least two very vital problems which have always been before the United Nations referred to. I wonder if you would like to discuss them. Certainly there is the whole problem of collective security and the problem of atomic energy.

MR. FULTON: I was interested in the Honorable Mr. Harold Macmillan's talk about the military arm of the United Nations -- the withered arm that never came into being, never functioned. However, the United Nations did take an excursion into the collective security, so-called, in the Korean War. As a result, this country furnished 95% of the men, materiel and casualties. And what did we get out of it? A stalemate. The Security Council also has been unable to bring about any kind of security in the Formosa area. Earlier this year, an attempt was made by New Zealand,

the United States, Britain and other countries, before the Security Council, to effect a cease-fire between Red China and Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalists. Premier Chou En-lai, the Peking Red Chinese Premier, was asked to come or send a representative to these sessions of the Security Council here in New York. He replied with a most insulting cablegram in which he said that Chiang Kai-shek's representatives had to be booted out and he would come here only on Russian terms and the Russians were demanding that we remove our 7th Fleet from the China Seas and take all our military forces out of their area before there could be any discussion on peace in that area.

DR. BROWN: Let's take up these points one at a time. First, the bedtime story that the United Nations is powerless now to play an effective role in creating a collective security system. This bedtime story arises from the belief -- I think a false belief -- which a good many estimable citizens had, that the Security Council was the only organ through which the United Nations could make its will effective. As former president Truman pointed out, this is tommyrot. The General Assembly has been able to take over and to assume many of the functions which were originally thought to be the primary responsibility of the Security Council. Now, as for Korea, I have always insisted, insist now, I will insist, I think, for the rest of my life and I think the majority of the American people will agree with me, that in Korea we were fighting a war essentially to defend the interests of the American people. We were able to do this far more effectively with the help that we got from the U.N. than we could have without that help. As for Formosa, I think the difficulty there is not too much U.N., but too little U.N. When we first went into Formosa -- or rather when we first neutralized the Formosan Strait, as an auxiliary or complimentary action to our entry into Korea -- we stated very plainly for the whole world to hear that the future political disposition of Formosa was a matter for the United Nations. Mr. Fulton might not remember this, but as long as we stood by that position we got an immense amount of support from Asian states, moral support, a good deal of economic support, etc., which was all put to very good use in Korea. Since that time a subtle change has taken place in American policy. We now have taken what is essentially a unilateral position with regard to the Formosan Straits. As a result, we have seen drain away a lot of invaluable support in Asia which we need and which we could get through the U. N. if we kept this question there.

MR. FULTON: Mr. Brown suggested I might not remember certain historical facts about the Korean War, but what I do remember is that we lost it according to the best advice from all commanders of our forces who were out there -- Stratemeyer, Wedemeyer, Admiral Joy, MacArthur and the rest of them have so testified that they were hamstrung in Washington and by the U.N.

DR. BROWN: Remember General Bradley? He told us that MacArthur was advocating the wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place.

MR. FULTON: I'm talking about the generals in the field.

DR. BROWN: You're not talking about the generals in Washington who were in a position then to see the whole picture. You're only talking about the generals in the field who had their attention riveted, as indeed they had to, on the immediate tactical problems that confronted them.

MR. FULTON: You choose your generals and I'll choose mine.

MR. WITMAN: There are a number of items which were left unanswered and we'll come back to those a little later on. On the other hand, I think that we ought to take a few seconds for each of you to comment on the international atomic proposal which Secretary Macmillan made. How about you first, Mr. Fulton?

MR. FULTON: Mr. Witman, I don't think anybody will disagree that we should get together and try to harness the atom for peaceful purposes and civilian uses and outlaw it for military purposes. What I'm worried about is how much the Russians are going to get out of this. I just hope we don't give too many kilograms away of that enriched uranium.

DR. BROWN: I don't think there is much danger of our giving away many kilograms of valuable uranium to the Soviet Union. There is the possibility that we

can make more of it available to people whose support we need all over the world -- people in Asia, people in the Near East, people in Africa, people in Western Europe -- people who might, in the long run, make the difference to us, who might, in fact, help America save itself. We need the support of these people and by making the peaceful development of atomic energy and all of the great benefits which can result from that available to them, we are doing ourselves a favor. Let's not forget that. I can only say in conclusion that I agree with Mr. Macmillan 100%. If I could agree with him a little more, I would.

MR. WITMAN: We are discussing the United Nations, 1945-1955. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov took the stage at San Francisco in a lengthy documentation of what many had heard before. For example, this translation of his references to the Soviet proposal for admission of Communist China.

MR. MOLOTOV: China's indubitable rights, the rights of the Chinese People's Republic, still go unrecognized in the United Nations. What will excuse such an abnormal situation for this instance of the violation of the legitimate rights of China. Everybody knows the true reason. The reason is that the People's Democratic Revolution has been victorious in China -- that the great Chinese people have taken the path of the construction of socialism. For that reason, the Chinese People's Republic is still shorn of the right to occupy its legitimate seat in the United Nations. The injustice and illegality of the situation that has just arisen are manifest. This sort of illegality cannot be allowed to continue, lest confidence in the United Nations be undermined. The Chinese People's Republic must without delay have every opportunity to have its representatives in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. It would be highly improper to forget that the country I am referring to is one whose population is 600 million. Of every four human beings on this globe, one is a Chinese. Nor can we ignore the dangerous situation which has arisen in the Far East, in the area of the island of Taiwan and the Chinese coastal islands. As is well-known, the islands of Taiwan and Pescadores and the coastal islands are historic Chinese territory. This has been recognized in a host of international agreements. The United Nations organization cannot be reconciled to a situation where this inalienable part of Chinese territory still is unrestored to China. The United Nations should take expeditious measures for the rapid settlement of this important problem.

MR. WITMAN: Mr. Molotov followed this statement of his case for Red China with a seven-point program which would, in his words "lead to the establishment of the necessary trust among nations."

MR. MOLOTOV: 1) There must be implementation of the well-known United Nations Assembly decision for the cessation of war propaganda in all countries; 2) Agreement amongst the great powers for the liquidation of military bases in foreign territories; 3) Development of action for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, with broad assistance in the production and technical fields to underdeveloped countries; 4) Agreement between the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France on the withdrawal of their troops from Germany, with the exception of small, temporary contingents, and the establishment of strictly limited local police contingents in various parts of Germany; 5) The settlement of outstanding problems in the Near and Far East in accord with the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity; 6) The removal of discrimination of all kinds which works against the establishment of broad international cooperation and international trade; 7) The expansion of international

cultural relations through large-scale exchange of delegations and the development of tourism.

MR. WITMAN: Foreign Minister Molotov's so-called seven-point program for peace was answered in these words on Friday by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

MR. DULLES: There is one extremely simple method of bringing to and end what is called the "cold war." It is this: Observe the Charter of the United Nations; refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in international relations and from the support and direction of subversion against the institutions of other countries.

To bring the "cold war" to an end, seven points are not needed. This one is sufficient.

MR. WITMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard statements from the Foreign Secretaries of the two largest powers to face each other in San Francisco. I am sure you want to discuss these comments. Which of you wants to start?

DR. BROWN: I'll be glad to. First of all, let's face the fact that Mr. Dulles sounds good and Mr. Molotov sounded awful. Mr. Molotov is one of those rare individuals who has such an unpleasant voice that the unpleasantness even comes over in translation, through an interpreter, who is speaking with other vocal cords altogether. However, we mustn't allow the unpleasant character of his arguments to put us asleep because it is important that we listen to this and that we try to make what we can of it. The first thing I noticed about Mr. Molotov's statements on Communist China was the hypocrisy of what he had to say when he advocated Chinese Communist representation in the U. N. Mr. Molotov could have had the Chinese Communists in the U. N., I think, six years ago if he wanted to. Instead, he instructed his representatives at Lake Success to walk out, to tie the Security Council up for a year, or almost for a year, and rendered it impossible for the Chinese Communists even to be considered for membership. The time came when the Chinese Communists entered the war in Korea and, of course, they were branded as aggressors by the United Nations and as long as this indictment remains on the record, there can be no possibility, it seems to me, of considering seating them in the United Nations. I would, however, like to put this question in perspective. It is an important question -- the question of the representation of China. It's a vitally important question, but it is not The most important question in the world. It's a \$16 question, or a \$32 question, but it is not the \$64 question. I can see that there might even be advantages to us in the long run. I'm not talking about now; I'm talking about a period of six months, a year, two years or five years from now. There might even be advantages to us in facing this question and having the Chinese Communists representatives sit at the conference tables of the U.N. To sum my position up in one word, I'll say this is a negotiable question. This is not a closed question.

MR. WITMAN: Mr. Brown, you commented on the first statement we had from Mr. Molotov on admission of Red China. Do you want to answer this, Mr. Fulton?

MR. FULTON: Only just this -- that I am delighted to be, at long last, in agreement with Dr. Brown on one of these questions. I agree that this was hypocrisy on the part of Molotov, as so many other statements of his have been during the last ten years, during the history of the United Nations. I would add that the Communist People's Republic of China have other things to accomplish to purge themselves and become a civilized country before they can be admitted to the U.N., and one of these things is to release the eleven American flyers who were shot down in a B-29 during the Korean War and some 500 of the Korean War personnel left stranded over there and rotting in the Chinese prisons, in complete violation of the Korean armistice agreement.

MR. WITMAN: I noticed in his seven-point program, Mr. Molotov, in one of the points, urges that agreement amongst the great powers for the liquidation of military bases in foreign territories is a requisite. What do you think about that? Can we

possibly afford to agree to the liquidation of military bases in foreign territories?

DR. BROWN: Mr. Pinay gave the answer to that. Mr. Pinay is the Foreign Minister of France. He said he knows of no foreign military bases. He only knows of common means that are put at the disposal of the community of interested nations to accomplish a common purpose. As I see it, this is something that can't be taken as a serious suggestion. I don't know whether Mr. Molotov expects to have us withdraw our vast military personnel or not, but I know that as long as this country keeps its senses, this is not going to happen.

MR. WITMAN: Well, certainly, one of the things he proposes is the withdrawal of our troops from Germany, except for a very small number, which puts us into a situation where our troops are withdrawn with Russia's fairly close, even if she does withdraw. What do you think about that, Mr. Fulton?

MR. FULTON: I think that's part of this Russian drive for neutralization of countries that might become buffer states between her and the Western so-called democracies.

MR. WITMAN: What about the other points in this seven-point program. Are there any there that you can pick out that you do like? I've chosen a couple here at random and you don't like either of them. Can't we agree at all on Mr. Molotov?

DR. BROWN: I think that Molotov's last point has something of value in it for us. As I recall, he said something about the necessity for expanding international cultural relations through the exchange of delegations and the development of tourism. Now, this sounds like a new open-door policy for the Russians and I am confident that Mr. Molotov has no intention of putting it into practice. I would suggest, however, that from time to time we have allowed ourselves to behave in a way which makes this kind of propaganda effective to other peoples in the world. Because of the difficulties that we make, or have made, over giving American citizens passports for travel, because of, I think, unreasonable difficulties that have sometimes been put in the way of allowing foreign scientists and artists and composers to come into this country, we have given a semblance of substance to this charge and that is what I want to emphasize here. The suggestion that Mr. Molotov is making is that we have closed our doors and that the Iron Curtain has descended over New York, but not over Europe. Well, we know that is tommyrot, but at the same time, we've got to prove every day of the year by deed as well as by word, that that is tommyrot.

MR. WITMAN: One of the things that startled me about the seven-point program was this last point in which we have the Russians now advocating the expansion of tourism, whereas they have never allowed any body to come through the Iron Curtain before. What do you think about that, Mr. Fulton?

MR. FULTON: My recollection is that after Russia was recognized by this country, that she opened the doors to American engineers and scientists and also tourists. In fact, we had an office for the American Chamber of Commerce in Moscow until 1937 when, overnight, there was a shift in the propaganda front and the purge trials came along. The Americans were booted out of Moscow and Russia and I might add that my own experience in traveling around Russia was that the Russians would let you travel only where they wanted you to go and you could never go to any sensitive part of the country.

MR. WITMAN: So that actually this isn't tourism in the sense in which we understand it, which he is probably proposing?

MR. FULTON: It's tourism by their Intourist Agency.

MR. WITMAN: Let's hear another excerpt from one of the San Francisco speakers. For months, India has been trying to bring the Soviet and American points of view together. These were the words of V. K. Krishna Menon.

MR. KRISHNA MENON: There are two great countries, each strong in their own selves, either militarily, economically or politically, who hold today in the hollow of their hand the destiny of mankind and we smaller people

are entitled to look to them to join hands together in the common service of humanity. It is their desire, as we know, and we only wish them the courage, the bravery, the wisdom and all that goes with it in order to make that step a great success.

We are happy, Mr. Chairman, that disarmament has made some progress. We feel that it has made far more progress than it has made before, and that when the General Assembly meets next year, it will be possible for the great nations to invite others to subscribe to the beginnings of what may be a peaceful world.

MR. WITMAN: Gentlemen, would you care to comment on Mr. Menon's observations?

MR. FULTON: Bringing up this old chestnut of disarmament strikes a bell with me. The United Nations has been discussing disarmament for nine years and gotten no closer to it. I don't know what Menon means about making some progress. The United Nations at its General Assembly last fall kicked the whole question back to a sub-commission which has been meeting in London and that sub-commission has suspended its talks awaiting the Geneva Conference at the summit. I suppose we do owe Mr. Krishna Menon some debt of gratitude for going into Peiping and effecting the release of four of our American jet pilots. The ironic thing is that Menon has the reputation of being extremely anti-American and pro-Russian. It's ironic that he went in there and sneaked these flyers out after Dag Hammarskjold, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, had been trying for six months to do so, and came back empty-handed.

DR. BROWN: I think that the success that we finally had in getting the American flyers back, or the handful of them that we do have back, was partly attributable of course, to Mr. Menon's work and it was also partly attributable to what Mr. Hammarskjold was doing on behalf of the whole membership of the U. N. After all, if we try to put ourselves in Chou En-lai's place, surely it makes sense that when Mr. Hammarskjold comes to Peiping representing, as he did, an aroused membership of the United Nations, this is going to have a very substantial effect. Now, if Mr. Krishna Menon follows this up and comes to Peiping also with the same plea, I welcome it. Obviously it is desirable to have this message delivered to Peiping as often as it can be. I was struck by what Mr. Fulton had to say about disarmament. I suppose, applying his logic to another worthy endeavor, that he would have had us fold up the American Cancer Society or the American Heart Fund or the American Society to find a cure to infantile paralysis ten years ago or more years ago, when they didn't produce positive results within a very limited timetable. Obviously disarmament is going to take time. It is one of the great critical questions of this century, and if the U. N. Disarmament Commission has not solved it in ten years, it only makes it more imperative that we get about it now and make progress.

MR. WITMAN: One of the things that impresses me in this discussion tonight and some of the things I've been reading recently, is the question of how do you evaluate the success of the United Nations in terms of whether the alleged success is achieved by the United Nations or by a member of the United Nations. I wonder if you could push that around a little bit further because you both referred to it. For instance, there is this matter of Korea to which you referred, Mr. Fulton, earlier, in which you pointed out that 95% of the effort in Korea was undertaken by the United States. How do you evaluate success of the U.N.? Is it to be attributed to the body acting as a whole, to the member nations?

DR. BROWN: I personally think we have to work inside the U. N. and we have to work outside the U. N. We have to pick our opportunities and exploit them wherever we can to reduce tension and to make ourselves stronger and the world. I think that Mr. Hammarskjold's attitude toward this is a very proper one. You'll notice he didn't claim any credit for the jet flyers being released. Mr. Hammarskjold

doesn't put himself in competition with the regional arrangements we have made for our own security.

MR. FULTON: Could I break in, Dr. Brown. I don't mean to disparage Mr. Hammarskjold's efforts, but he did or his secretariat claimed credit for those flyers and they took a lot of pictures and made a lot of statements over there, because I was there and there was quite a little feeling between Dag Hammarskjold and Krishna Menon over this thing.

DR. BROWN: This is something of which I have no knowledge whatever. I remember that Mr. Lodge gave Mr. Hammarskjold a pat on the back -- as indeed he deserved it. But let's not quarrel over who put the most pressure on the Chinese Communists. Let's be thankful that we got the boys back. Let's use our U.N. resource. Let's use our friends in India. Let's encourage everybody who will make an effort in this direction to make it. And if we can make it through the U.N., let's do it there too.

MR. WITMAN: We must remember that what we are talking about is an attempt to evaluate the successes and the shortcomings, as we said at the outset of this program, of the United Nations. I'd like to pursue this a little bit further. Is it true that the mere existence of the United Nations for ten years proves that the United Nations is valuable. Now, this went through pretty near every speech I heard given at San Francisco. Everyone says the very fact that we are here proves that the United Nations is a fine organization. Is this true do you think, gentlemen?

MR. FULTON: By the same token you could say that because there was no major war for twenty years after the League of Nations was founded, that for twenty years the League of Nations was successful.

DR. BROWN: I don't think that the argument holds water. We might say that the electoral college, because it still exists after 150 years, is an important part of our Constitution. Obviously it is not. No, I think the United Nations today is an important institution today because it has assisted those governments, like America, whose foreign policy goals are consistent with the Charter, to make progress toward the attainment of those goals.

MR. FULTON: Do you include the Soviet Union in that?

DR. BROWN: No, I do not. Obviously the Soviet Union's foreign policy objectives, so far as we have been able to interpret them over the past ten years since the war, are not in harmony with the Charter. They are not in harmony with the objectives of the Charter. But the Charter is a useful instrument for holding up to the attention of mankind on every conceivable occasion, the behavior of the Soviet Union and to expose it for what it is.

MR. FULTON: The Charter was a beautiful blueprint but the house is a wreck, I think.

MR. WITMAN: What about those objectives? Were those objectives too much for mankind at this stage of our political development. Do you think we are expecting too much of the United Nations -- is that one of our problems?

DR. BROWN: I think that that certainly is one of our problems, and I think that in our relief at having the war over in 1945, a lot of Americans oversold themselves on the U.N. and they began to think that wonderful results were going to flow from it overnight. They forgot that peace is a matter of hard work and even through the United Nations we have to work at it every day in order to make it an effective thing -- an alive thing in this world.

MR. WITMAN: What about the fact that all I hear discussed here tonight are the political aspects of the United Nations? Are there other aspects of the U.N. -- certain other objectives of the United Nations which we could evaluate to help determine the successes and shortcomings of the organization -- or are the political ones the only ones?

MR. FULTON: No, there are specialized agencies working in the fields of world health, meteorology, chasing the opium runners and eradicating rinderpests in Pakistan,

but all these things could be effective without a United Nations organization.

DR. BROWN: I think that the new peace that President Eisenhower urged upon us in his speech at the United Nations is the kind of peace that is incorporated or envisioned in the Charter. That's what I mean when I say that the ends and purposes of the Charter are precisely those of the United States. It is one of the best moral statements of American foreign policy that you could find anywhere. Mr. Eisenhower calls for a new peace. It's to be an integral peace. It's to be a sound peace in terms of world economy, world social relationships as well as these political questions -- and that is one thing that I think we often overlook about the Charter, the integral nature of it.

MR. WITMAN: Do either of you gentlemen see any foreshadowing of the meeting at the summit and this meeting that was held last week in San Francisco?

DR. BROWN: That was on everybody's mind throughout the sessions and the foreign ministers were meeting from time to time to discuss arrangements that could be made now in advance in preparation for the summit meeting.

MR. WITMAN: Can you see any sign of the possible result at the summit in San Francisco?

MR. FULTON: No, I can't see that. I think that this is another case in which the big powers are more or less bypassing the United Nations. The foreign ministers met in San Francisco just because they happened to be there for this laudatory pat-on-the-back session and all this sweet reasonableness on the part of the Russians makes me feel that we ought to keep our atomic bombs dry.

MR. WITMAN: If I may come in here, I think it is appropriate that we turn now to the remarks of a man who played such a vital role in these ten years of the United Nations....the man upon whose shoulders rested a momentous decision five years ago yesterday when he called upon the resources of the United Nations to stop the troops of North Korea when they crossed the 38th parallel. Former President Harry S. Truman.

MR. TRUMAN: Today, for the whole world, the choice is not between the United States and something better. The choice is between the United Nations -- between the principles of the United Nations -- and international anarchy and violence which may lead to total destruction for all the nations of the world. In this atomic age, no nation can live unto itself alone. There is no hope for any nation either in isolationism or in imperialism. The United Nations is the best hope of mankind for deliverance from mutual destruction. It is even more important in this respect than it was ten years ago. The United Nations is a beacon of hope to a world that has no choice but to live together or to die together. The Charter may not be perfect, but no charter can provide easy or automatic solutions for the complex and difficult problems of international life. The Charter does give us the means -- the opportunity -- of meeting and resolving these problems by peaceful processes. In our impatient zeal for perfection, let us not lose faith in the Charter and the means it provides for working together for our common salvation. We have come a long way in the past ten years. During this fateful period two great forces have emerged to play an essential role in shaping the destiny of mankind. One of these is the United Nations, man's most ambitious attempt to keep the peace. The other is the development of nuclear science, which has unleashed physical power of a magnitude hitherto undreamed of -- a magnitude great enough to make fundamental changes in man's way of life for better or for worse. We in our generation are confronted with the magnificent challenge of reconciling these two great forces. We must use the one and harness the other so that we may combine them for the everlasting benefit of mankind.

MR. WITMAN: So with that footnote to history by Mr. Truman, I want to thank you, Benjamin H. Brown and William Fulton, Jr., for joining us on this occasion.